

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Please cancel claim 1 without prejudice. Claims 2-15 have been added and are pending in the present application.

1. 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected claim 1 as being vague and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, Applicant has cancelled claim 1 in lieu of pending claims 2-15.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “ePALS Classroom Exchange First to Provide Teacher Monitored Email With Instant Language Translation” (hereinafter “*EP Article*”), in view of the article “MessageLabs: British Government Takes On MessageLabs Virus Protection” (hereinafter “*ML Article*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

As noted above, claim 1 has been cancelled. Independent claim 2 is directed to a method for filtering and monitoring of data transmission in a multi-level system for a plurality of users. Claim 2 requires defining a plurality of levels of a multi-level system, wherein at least one level comprises filtering and monitoring; establishing a hierarchy for the plurality of levels; and creating a user account associated with at least one of the

plurality of levels, wherein the user account controls filtering and monitoring applied to other user accounts associated with the levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels.

The *EP Article* does not disclose several elements set forth in claim 2, including a multi-level system. Accordingly, the *EP Article* cannot disclose a hierarchy for the multi-level system nor can it disclose the ability of each level of the system to inherit the filtering and monitoring of the levels above. The *MP Article* fails to remedy the deficiencies of the *EP Article* because it likewise does not disclose a multi-level system. Furthermore, due to the absence of a multi-level system, the *MP Article* cannot disclose a hierarchy for the multi-level system nor can it disclose the ability of each level of the system to inherit the filtering and monitoring of the levels above. Therefore, claim 2 is not obvious in view of the *EP Article*, the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two.

The remaining pending claims are dependent upon claim 2 and recite additional requirements. Thus, the remaining claims are also not obvious in view of the *EP Article*, the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two.

3. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, the pending claims are not obvious in view of the *EP Article*, the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two. As all outstanding issues have been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests favorable action by the Examiner and withdrawal of the cited rejections. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

Application No. 10/619,097
Response of Nov. 14, 2008
Office Action of May 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP.

/s/ Jeremy C. Whitley /
Jeremy C. Whitley
Registration No. 58,775
ip@nelsonmullins.com
1320 Main Street | Suite 1700
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Office: (803) 255-9764
Fax: (803) 255-9831